

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 ISABEL VELA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 TOW GUYZ LLC, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.  
16

Case No. 1:25-cv-00878-JLT-EPG

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THIS  
ACTION BE REMANDED TO STATE  
COURT

(Doc. 5.)

17 Isabela Vela is proceeding *pro se*<sup>1</sup> action against Defendants Tow Guyz, LLC, et al.,  
18 based on allegations Defendants unlawfully allowed entry into the office spaces she rented from  
19 Defendants and Defendants unlawfully evicted her without a court order. (Doc 1. at 15-17) This  
20 matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and  
21 Local Rule 302.

22 On September 9, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge entered findings and  
23 recommendations, recommending that this action be remanded to the Superior Court of  
24 California, County of Tulare for improper removal (Doc. 5.) The Court served the findings and  
25 recommendations on the plaintiff and notified her that any objections were due within 30 days.  
26 (*Id.* at 5.) The Court advised her that the “failure to file objections within the specified time may  
27

---

28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has a pending application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Doc. 2.)

1 result in the waiver of rights on appeal.” (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39  
2 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections<sup>2</sup> and the time to do so has passed.

3 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a *de*  
4 *novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including the objections, the  
5 Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.  
6 Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations issued on September 9, 2025, are **ADOPTED**  
8 **IN FULL**. (Doc. 20.)
- 9 2. This case be **REMANDED** back to the appropriate state court.
- 10 3. Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2.) be **DENIED** as moot.

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: **October 20, 2025**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>2</sup> On September 23, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Accept Federal Jurisdiction After Denial of Removal. (Doc. 6.)  
27 Generally, Plaintiff argues that the Court should accept jurisdiction over her case because it is a § 1983 claim and  
28 arises from violations of due process, equal protection and access to justice within the Tulare County Superior Court  
Proceedings. (*Id.* at 1-2.) Furthermore, Plaintiff states that this motion is meant to establish “independent federal  
claims arising under the Constitution and § 1983.” (*Id.* at 1.)